Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/749,431	GROVE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MARK FADOK	3625	

	WARK FADOR	3023	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	one openanty number of finally reje	otod olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOI -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamone (1 1 0 2 0 2 1 //
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).		ory mod amoramor	it carrooming and
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	I NOT I II II II II	199	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceurs Statement(s). 		i condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☒ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.	1 10/30/00/ Fapel NU(8)		
	/Mark Fadok/	mit 2005	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	HII 30∠3	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that McBrayer does not teach "including publishing the answer on the listing for the item". To further clarify, the examiner directs the applicant's attention to McBrayer, col 13, lines 9-16 and FIGs 23 and 24. Item 550 on FIG 23 which clearly teaches that the question and answers are "published in association with the listing".

Applicant may argue that the questions and answers are not printed directly on one listing webpage and there needs to be access to another web page from the main page in order to access the questions and answers. The examiner notes that the phrase "publishing questions and answers on the listing" is only provided in the decision aspect of applicant's invention (Applicant's PG Pub to the instant application 20050015325 para 0123 and FIG 9, item 924) and that the actionable portion of the description (FIG 9, item 930 denotes that the listing is "published in association with the listing" (see also Applicant's PG Pub to the instant application 20050015325 para 0123) or "within a listing" (Applicant's PG Pub to the instant application 20050015325 para abstract)). Further applicant's specification does not particularly point out that "on the listing" would necessarily connote that the answer needs to be displayed on a particular single page. The examiner notes that it is a common convention to place links to other related pages from a main page in a listing when to much information is available, thus creating a less cluttered presentation of the listing.

Applicant argues the examiner's use of Official Notice and asks for evidentiary support. To accommodate this request the examiner provided the following references.

Dvir para 0040 teaches that "Under no circumstances will the Auctioneer release any Supplier information without the permission of the Supplier", and Shavit col 14, lines 57-62 "Additionally, the system can produce either reports or answers to inquiries at the buyer's request, subject to approval of the information provider, on a wide selection of information about its orders, shipments, invoices, outstanding loads, usage of various items, etc."

Applicant argues that In re Einstein lends no support to the rejection of the instant claims, because no where in McBrayer is the buyer and seller described as "working parts" of any device." The examiner finds applicant's arguments persuasive, therefore this rejection will be removed from the next Office Action.

The examiner recognizes applicant's statement that the previous rejection incorrectly noted that applicant argued that the independent claims were not addressed and that Applicant's response actually stated that the rejections of "dependent claims 18-27 and 29-34 were not supported". This issue appears to be moot as the examiner has provided a detailed mapping of the dependent claims in the previous Office Action and applicant has not restated the argument in the after final response date 5/17/2010..

Continuation of 13. Other: See PTO 892 for listing of references in response to request to support Official Notice.